



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.								
10/803,551	03/18/2004	Michael Anthony Dean	03-4027	5673								
25537 VERIZON PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP 1320 North Court House Road 9th Floor ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909	7590 03/23/2012		<div>EXAMINER</div> <div>PHAM, HUNG Q</div> <table border="1"><thead><tr><th>ART UNIT</th><th>PAPER NUMBER</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>2159</td><td></td></tr></tbody></table> <div><table border="1"><thead><tr><th>NOTIFICATION DATE</th><th>DELIVERY MODE</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>03/23/2012</td><td>ELECTRONIC</td></tr></tbody></table></div>		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2159		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	03/23/2012	ELECTRONIC
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER											
2159												
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE											
03/23/2012	ELECTRONIC											

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@verizon.com

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/803,551

**Applicant(s)**

DEAN, MICHAEL ANTHONY

**Examiner**

HUNG Q. PHAM

**Art Unit**

2159

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-CIBD)  
Paper No(s) Mail Date \_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s) Mail Date \_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed in this application after a decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, but before the filing of a Notice of Appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or the commencement of a civil action. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/28/2011 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) have been considered but are moot because the arguments do not apply to any of the references being used in the current rejection.

### ***Duplicate Claims***

Claim 16 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 1. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Dependent claims 17 and 18 are objected for at least the reasons as noted above with regard to claim 16.

***Claim Objections***

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: *types* (Line 13). Appropriate correction is required (*types of said instances* is respectfully suggested).

Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 11 are objected for at least the reasons as noted with regard to claim 1.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

**Claims 1-4 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.**

A patentable process must (1) be tied to a particular apparatus or machine or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. See *In re Bilski*, 545 F.3d 943, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008). The method of claims 1-4 and 16-18 is non-statutory in view of *In re Bilski*, e.g., the recited method is not tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or it transforms a particular article into a different state or thing.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

**Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.**

Regarding claims 17 and 18, the limitations *at least one of the Semantic Web structured resources has been converted from non-web data and the non-web data includes at least one of a database table and a database extract* were not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

**Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12, 13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Claim 1 recites the limitation "*said statements*" in the steps of constructing and identifying. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 2 and 4 recite the limitation "*said graphical representations*" in the steps of grouping. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "*said statements*" in the steps of parsing and constructing. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 6 is rejected for at least the reasons as noted with regard to claim 5.

Claim 7 recites the limitation "*said graphical representations*" in the steps of grouping. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 8, 9, 12 and 13 include limitations similar to claims 1 and 2. Claims 8, 9, 12 and 13 are rejected for at least the reasons as noted with regard to claims 1 and 2.

Claim 16 recites the limitation "*said statements*" in the steps of constructing and identifying. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by BRITTON et al. [US 6,925,457 B2].**

Regarding claim 1, BRITTON teaches method of obtaining search results, comprising:

*identifying tagged statements in at least one Semantic Web structured resource, wherein the tagged statements each include subject/object/predicate triples* (As taught by BRITTON, legacy databases 140 of FIG. 1 represent sources of information in a company, organization or other entity (BRITTON, Col. 3-Lines 42-45). Tagged statements as in Col. 5-Lines 40-54 from the legacy databases are extracted periodically via requests, and stored in the hologram data store 114 as RDF triples (BRITTON, Col. 4-Lines 1-45 and Col. 6-Lines 43-58), wherein each tagged RDF statement includes subject/object/predicate as in Col. 5-Lines 15-20 (BRITTON, Col. 4-Lines 54-64). The BRITTON teaching as noted reads on the claimed limitation *identifying tagged statements in at least one Semantic Web structured resource, wherein the tagged statements each include subject/object/predicate triples*, i.e., tagged statement as in Col. 5-Lines 40-54 from the legacy databases are identified, wherein the tagged statements each include subject/object/predicate);

*parsing the tagged statements from the at least one Semantic Web structured resource to identify component words* (BRITTON, Col. 7-Lines 20-21 & 24-30);

*constructing an index from said component words, said index relating said component words to said statements* (BRITTON, Col. 7-Lines 40-49).

BRITTON further discloses an SQL query for reconstitute the RDF triple corresponding to queried subject, predicate and object:

```
SELECT m.uri_string, t.resource_flg,  
concat (n1.n_value, r1.r_value) as subj,  
concat (n3.n_value, r3.r_value) as pred,  
concat (n3.n_value, r3.r_value),  
l.l_value  
FROM triples t, models m, resources r1, resources r2,  
namespaces n1, namespaces n2  
LEFT JOIN literals l on t.object=l.l_hash  
LEFT JOIN resources r3 on t.object=r3.r_hash  
LEFT JOIN namespaces n3 on r3.r_value=n3.n_value  
WHERE t.subject=r1.r_hash AND r1.n_hash=n1.n_  
hash AND  
t.predicate=r2.r_hash AND r2.n_hash=n2.n_hash AND  
m.uri_id=l.m_hash AND t.subject=hash("postal://  
zip#02886") AND  
t.predicate=hash('http://www.metatamix.com/  
postalcode/2.0#town') AND  
t.object=hash('warwick')
```

The SQL query for reconstitute the RDF triple reads on the claimed limitation:

*comparing said component words to a search term to identify matching words* (component words from TRIPLE table are compared to "02886", "town" and "warwick" according to FROM & WHERE clauses);

*identifying related ones of said statements for said matching words based on said index* (triples statement are identified for "02886", "town" and "warwick" based on index using hash codes according to FROM & WHERE clauses);

*obtaining predicates, instances, types of said instances, and literal values of said related ones of said statements* (According to SELECT clause, predicates, subject instance, resource\_flg indicating instant type and literal value (L value) of the RDF statement are obtained), *wherein each of the*



*predicates, instances, types of said instances, and literal values is found in at least one of the at least one Semantic Web Structured resources* (BRITTON, Col. 5-Line 55→Col. 6-Lines 32); and

*summarizing said predicates, instances, types, and literal values for presentation to a user as said search results* (predicates, subject instance, resource\_flg indicating instant type and literal value (L value) are summarized and presented similar to the result set at Col. 12-Lines 25-30).

Regarding claim 2, BRITTON further discloses the steps of *arranging said predicates, instances, types, and literal values into one or more graphical representations*; and *grouping said graphical representations according to at least one of said types and said literal values* (BRITTON, FIG. 2-Lines 34-42).

Regarding claim 3, BRITTON further discloses the step of *identifying Semantic Web structured resources to obtain identified Semantic Web structured resources*; *gathering statements from said identified Semantic Web structured resources to obtain gathered statements*; *presenting said gathered statements for parsing of said gathered statements*; wherein *constructing an index comprises updating said index based on the parsing of said gathered statements*; and wherein *said identifying, gathering and presenting are iteratively performed* (See claim 5).

Regarding claim 4, BRITTON further discloses the steps of *arranging said predicates, instances, types, and literal values into one or more graphical representations*; and *grouping said graphical representations according to at least one of said types and said literal values* (BRITTON, FIG. 2-Lines 34-42).

Regarding claim 5, BRITTON teaches a computer-readable medium containing instructions for controlling a processor to construct a database by:

*visiting sites on a network to identify Semantic Web structured resources* (As taught by BRITTON, legacy databases 140 of FIG. 1 represent sources of information in a company, organization or other entity (BRITTON, Col. 3-Lines 42-45). Data from the legacy databases is extracted periodically via requests in the form of RDF (BRITTON, Col. 4-Lines 1-34 and FIG. 1A) and stored in in the hologram data store 114 as RDF triples (BRITTON, Col. 4-Lines 35-37), wherein each RDF triple includes subject/object/predicate (BRITTON, Col. 4-Lines 54-64). The BRITTON teaching as noted reads on the claimed limitation *visiting sites on a network to identify Semantic Web structured resources*, i.e., the sites in database system 140 on a network as in FIG. 1 is visited via requests to identify RDF resources);

*gathering statements from said Semantic Web structured resources according to tags associated with each statement, wherein the tagged statements each include subject/object/ predicate triples* (As noted above, tagged statements in RDF resource comprising subject/object/predicate triples are gathered for storing in hologram data store 114 as RDF triples);

*parsing of said statements to identify component words* (BRITTON, Col. 7-Lines 20-21 & 24-30);  
*constructing an index from said component words, said index relating said component words to said statements* (BRITTON, Col. 7-Lines 40-49);

*storing said index as said database on said computer-readable medium* (This claimed limitation is inherent in BRITTON); and

*updating said database by iteratively performing said visiting, said gathering, said parsing, said constructing, and said storing* (As noted above, data from the legacy databases is extracted periodically (BRITTON, Col. 4-Lines -19). Therefore, each time the data is extracted the index is updated by performing the steps as noted above).

Regarding claim 6, BRITTON further discloses the step of *obtain search results for a search query using said database by: obtaining predicates, instances, types of said instances, and literal values of said*

*statements related to search terms of said query by said index* (As noted above with regard to claim 1, according to SELECT clause, predicates, subject instance, resource\_flg indicating instant type and literal value (L value) of the RDF statement are obtained), wherein *each of the predicates, instances, types of said instances, and literal values is found in at least one of the Semantic Web Structured resources* (BRITTON, Col. 5-Line 55→Col. 6-Lines 32), (BRITTON, Col. 5-Line 55→Col. 6-Lines 32)); and *summarizing said predicates, instances, types, and literal values for presentation to a user as said search results* (As noted above with regard to claim 1, predicates, subject instance, resource\_flg indicating instant type and literal value (L value) are summarized and presented similar to the result set at Col. 12-Lines 25-30).

Regarding claim 7, BRITTON further discloses the step of *arranging said predicates, instances, types, and literal values into one or more graphical representations; and grouping said graphical representations according to at least one of said types and said literal values* (BRITTON, FIG. 2-Lines 34-42).

Claims 8-16 include limitations similar to claims 1-4. Claims 8-16 are rejected for at least the reasons as noted above with regard to claims 1-4.

**Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over BRITTON et al. [US 6,925,457 B2].**

Regarding claim 17, as taught by BRITTON, legacy databases include a database that is maintained by Oracle database management system (BRITTON, Col. 3-Lines 41-51), wherein SQL query is used to extract data from the legacy database periodically using connectors 108

(BRITTON, Col. 1-Lines 26). As shown in Box 152 of FIG. 1A, RDF data is from connectors 108.

For at least the reasons as noted, the claimed limitation *at least one of the Semantic Web structured resources has been converted from non-web data* is either inherent from or obvious over BRITTON's teaching, i.e., the RDF resources were from data returned from SQL query.

Regarding claim 18, as noted above with regard to claim 17, the claimed limitation *the non-web data includes at least one of a database table and a database extract* is taught by BRITTON, i.e., data is extracted from legacy databases.

#### **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HUNG Q. PHAM whose telephone number is (571)272-4040. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JAMES K. TRUJILLO can be reached on 571-272-3677. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you

Art Unit: 2159

would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HUNG Q. PHAM  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2159

/HUNG Q. PHAM/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2159  
March 18, 2012